

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 58 are pending, with Claims 1, 5, 10, 18, 23, 28, 36, and 44 being independent. Claims 5 through 50 and 52 through 58 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended.

Claim 2 was objected to for an informality, and has been amended as kindly suggested in the Official Action to obviate said objection.

Claims 1, 4, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,871,266 (Negishi, et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, an imaging lens system for imaging an object image onto image taking means, with moving the whole or part of the system during focusing for a distance to an object from an infinity side to a near side.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Negishi, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Negishi, et al.'s optical system is a projection optical system for projecting a secondary image of an image creation portion onto a screen. Applicant also submits that Negishi, et al.'s screen would be located with a finite distance but not at the infinity side.

Claims 1, 4, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0021031 A1 (Suzuki). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, $\beta \geq 0.5$, where β is a maximum imaging magnification.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Suzuki fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed feature as recited, inter alia, in Claim 1. The Official Action relies upon paragraph [0201], which states that $M=2.980$. However, Applicant respectfully submits that lens system TC is an afocal system without an imaging function, and M is an afocal magnification, which is defined by the equation $M=fF/|fR|$ in paragraph [0055]. Applicant respectfully submits that such a magnification is not the same as the imaging magnification as recited in Claim 1. The Official Action says that the overall optical system in Suzuki is an imaging lens system; however, Applicant respectfully submits that the fact that $M=2.980$ does not mean that the imaging magnification of the overall optical system satisfies the requirement in Claim 1.

Claims 1, 2, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 5,067,803 (Ohno) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0015848 A1 (Nakai). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, moving the whole or part of the system during focusing for a distance to an object from an infinity side to a near side, with $\beta \geq 0.5$, where β is a maximum imaging magnification.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Ohno nor Nakai, even in combination, assuming, arguendo, that such could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, inter alia, in Claim 1. The Official Action states that Ohno will inherently move as claimed; however, Applicant notes that for disposable photographic cameras, as discussed at col. 1, lines 11-30 of Ohno, normally the lens systems do not move a whole or a part for focusing. The Official Action also states that Ohno discloses a lens system producing enlargement images which inherently have an imaging magnification

greater than one. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the references in Ohno to enlargement are references to making an enlarged print of an image which has been taken by the camera, and are not references to enlarging the image via the lens system. It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead the artisan to arrive at the claimed features.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over either Suzuki or Negishi, et al., in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,909,322 (Bietry). All rejections are respectfully traversed, as the Official Action has not shown any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead the artisan to attempt to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of Suzuki or Negishi, et al. with the teachings of Bietry, assuming, arguendo, that the same could be combined.

The Official Action also stated that Claims 1 and 51 would read on U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0003490 (Kawasaki, et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 5,444,569 (Broome). This statement is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, moving the whole or part of the system during focusing for a distance to an object from an infinity side to a near side.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kawasaki, et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed feature as recited, inter alia, in Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Kawasaki, et al.'s lens system is for a finite distance.

Furthermore, Claim 1 recites, inter alia, $\beta \geq 0.5$, where β is a maximum imaging magnification.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that Broome fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-discussed claimed feature as recited, inter alia, in Claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Broome discloses, e.g., a Galilean telescope (e.g., figures and col. 2,

lines 12-27). Applicant respectfully submits that the same is an afocal system, and the magnification thereof is not the imaging magnification as claimed.

It is further respectfully submitted that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
Daniel S. Glueck
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSGdc

DC_MAIN 163564v1